

1
2
3 STEVEN WAYNE BONILLA,
4 Plaintiff,
5
6 v.
7
8 JUDGE JEFFREY S. WHITE et. al.,
9 Defendants.
10
11

12 Case Nos. [24-cv-4623-PJH](#)
13 [24-cv-4687-PJH](#)
14 [24-cv-5993-PJH](#)

15 **ORDER DISMISSING MULTIPLE
16 CASES WITH PREJUDICE**

17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner, has filed multiple pro se civil rights complaints under 42
18 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is a condemned prisoner who also has a pending federal habeas
19 petition in this court with appointed counsel. See *Bonilla v. Ayers*, Case No. 08-0471
20 YGR. Plaintiff is also represented by counsel in state court habeas proceedings. See *In
re Bonilla*, Case No. 20-2986 PJH, Docket No. 1 at 7.

21 Plaintiff presents nearly identical claims in these actions. He names as
22 defendants various federal and state judges. He seeks relief regarding his underlying
23 conviction or how his other cases were handled by the state and federal courts.

24 To the extent that plaintiff seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) in these cases,
25 he has been disqualified from proceeding IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) unless he is
26 “under imminent danger of serious physical injury” at the time he filed his complaint. 28
27 U.S.C. 1915(g); *In re Steven Bonilla*, Case No. 11-3180 CW; *Bonilla v. Dawson*, Case
28 No. 13-0951 CW.

29 The allegations in these complaints do not show that plaintiff was in imminent
30 danger at the time of filing. Therefore, he may not proceed IFP. Moreover, even if an

1 IFP application were granted, his lawsuits would be barred under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512
2 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994), *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43-54 (1971), *Demos v. U.S.*
3 *District Court*, 925 F.2d 1160, 1161-62 (9th Cir. 1991) or *Mullis v. U.S. Bankruptcy Court*,
4 828 F.2d 1385, 1393 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the cases are dismissed with
5 prejudice. The court notes that plaintiff has an extensive history of filing similar frivolous
6 cases.¹

7 Furthermore, these are not cases in which the undersigned judge's impartiality
8 might be reasonably questioned due to the repetitive and frivolous nature of the filings.
9 See *United States v. Holland*, 519 F.3d 909, 912 (9th Cir. 2008) (absent legitimate
10 reasons to recuse himself or herself, a judge has a duty to sit in judgment in all cases
11 assigned to that judge).²

12 The clerk shall terminate all pending motions and close these cases. The clerk
13 shall return, without filing, any further documents plaintiff submits in these closed cases.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: August 27, 2024

16
17 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton

18 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 ¹ The undersigned is the fourth judge assigned cases filed by plaintiff. This is the 66th
order issued by the undersigned since April 30, 2020, pertaining to 889 different cases.
27 Plaintiff filed 962 other cases with the three other judges since 2011.

28 ² Plaintiff names the undersigned as defendant in one of these cases, though presents no
specific allegations. See Case No. 24-cv-4687-PJH. Plaintiff does not seek recusal, nor
is recusal warranted in light of the frivolous nature of the case.